

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

2008 JUL 24 PM 3:11

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Huff ~~CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT~~
 FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 7/18/2008 ~~SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA~~
 CASE NO.: 08cv0725 H (WMC) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff BY Rm ~~DEPUTY~~
 CASE TITLE: Akers v. Rokusek, et al
 DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion for Reconsideration for the Second Time...

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>OTHER: Case closed.</u>

Date forwarded: 7/21/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☐ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: HUFF

Dated: 7/24/08
cc: All Parties

By: LCI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MONTGOMERY CARL AKERS,
EcP # 02866-081,
PLAINTIFF,

REJECTED

VS.

JEQUELYN E. ROKUSEK, ET AL.,
DEFENDENTS.

MOTION PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULES
OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, RULE 59(e) FOR
RECONSIDERATION FOR THE SECOND TIME
OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE A COLLATERAL
ORDER GRANTING NOTICE OF APPEAL TO
BE FILED

COMES NOW THE PLAINTIFF MONTGOMERY
CARL AKERS, IN PRO SE, WITH THE ABOVE